Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/821,860	CABRELE, FEDERICO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.	(3)Somasheka	() () () () () () () () () ()
(2) <u>Benjamis Houptman</u> .	(3) Somasheka (4) Kerth Towns	end (+03) 535.
Date of Interview: 23 February 2007.		7017
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)⊠ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: <i>QQQ</i> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: #erall \$ F15che/		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: see attached talking point	ofe LOVE I IC	auptman & Berner, LLP ectual Property Attorneys
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments wi		
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no c allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached		Keith J. Townsend Patent Agent
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INT FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTE requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	e last Offic 1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 3/ OF ONE Alexandria, Virginia USA 2231 Phone: (703) 684-1111 Fax: (703) 518-5499	direct: (703) 535-70' ktownsend@ipfirm.co
1-100 peramenor agrees	to review Ver	14 haloro
requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Heelh- examiner agrees to reverse Wernet to Jefemene y it teaches against using the fastered unaturals offer than metal or bruch such that teeth unaturals offer than metal or bruch such that area; and		
u materials offer than metal a brief such frust area; and would a NOT grap in and a place contact area; and would a work or be added. Ex. with call thus have no reason to work or be added. Ex. with call thus have no reason to work or be added. They will call the state of the call with a desermenation on this.		
Would a NOT grant work or be added. Ex. with Call Thus have no reason to work or be added. Ex. with Call Hus have no reason to work or be added. Ex. wor		
Thus have to with desermentation	on this.	fore skederal
As to nomenclasive ex believes it is full a way		
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	5 ' Examiner's sign	mayrement ature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached talking points.

Examiner reviewed Vernet after interview, and has determined that Vernet does not teach away from using the pin in softer materials, including drywall. Specifically, examiner notes col 2, lines 28-35, and also notes that Vernet col 1 lines 62 (Under SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION) 3 refers to US 4617692 as a similar pin. and that pin is expressly used in wallboard.

Docket No.: 713-1121 PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Federico CABRELE : Confirmation No. 1818

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/821,860 : Group Art Unit: 3677

Filed: April 12, 2004 : Examiner: Katherine W Mitchell

For: SCREW ANCHOR

Points for Discussion - interview scheduled for 1.30 pm Friday 02/23/2007

1. The final office action asserts (under §103) that Vernet contains disclosure that teaches the hypothetical person of ordinary skill that some of the slots 13 would be understood to be "main longitudinal slots" (MLS) while the remainder would be understood as being "secondary longitudinal slots" (SLS).

How does the hypothetical person of ordinary skill know which are which and why would any differentiation be made between what must be taken to be essentially identical slots? Under § 103 there must be a reason. §103 is different from §102 in that a purely arbitrary selection based on nothing more than a working knowledge of the claims (dubious even under §102), is definitely not permitted under §103. Teachings which would actually lead to this conclusion must be presented/identified.

2. Fischer discloses the use of teeth 5. The rejection purports that it would be obvious to add these to the Vernet arrangement because they would dig into the face of the rear wall once the Vernet arrangement was deformed to the condition shown in Fig. 4.

However, the deformed portion of Vernet is not within a bore as per Fischer and the more surface area of the deformed portion of Vernet which engages the rear wall of the "hollow brick 1" of Vernet, the more friction will be generated and the more resistance to rotation will be produced. The provision of teeth such as found in Fischer would very likely reduce the surface area even if plastically distorted and, because they would have to be made of the same pliable material as the remainder of the fastener, be totally incapable of digging into the brick. All that would probably result would be the reduction in the amount of surface area in engagement with the rear face of the brick 1 and a loss of frictional engagement.

Further, once distorted to the configuration shown in Fig. 4, the Vernet arrangement is not going to be pulled back out through the bore and any additional bits and pieces would be totally unnecessary. The addition of teeth to improve this would be pointless overkill.